

Remarks

Set out below is an explanation regarding the structural/functional difference (i.e., **kink 13**) between the present invention and the cited patent based on the comparison drawing (see ATTACHMENT).

According to the comparison drawing, it is obvious that the essential structure of the present invention is on the left hand side of the drawing, and the fixed structure of the prior art is on the right hand side of the drawing (i.e., the cited patents). More specifically, the most significant structural/essential difference resides in the unique structure **kink 13** disclosed in the present invention. On the other hand, from current drawings FIG. 7A and FIG. 8A, it is evident that any possible micro-deformations (i.e., 22 & 22') would happen in the structures of the present invention and the cited patents. However, such micro-deformations shall take place in different regions and cause different technical results depending on whether the unique structure kink 13 is involved.

In view of the technical contents/structures disclosed in FIG. 7A and FIG. 8A, both structures (12) can absorb the specific STRESS generated by the package basically when the working temperature is changed. However, the actual STRESS would not be completely absorbed only by means of the structures (12). In other words, the rest of the STRESS still needs to be released in the manner of so-called micro-deformations, labeled 22 in FIG. 7A in the cited patent and labeled 22' in the present invention. Notice the different regions where the micro-deformations happen. Referring to FIG. 7A of the cited patent, the micro-deformation, such as the enlarged expression and the curve labeled 22, would happen to a contacting interface between the solder platform 17 and the die 16, and this micro-deformation should result in the rough contacting interface and would cause damage to the die 16 and decrease yield during the process.

In contrast, referring to FIG. 8A of the present invention, it is obvious that the region where the micro-deformation happens is different from that in the cited patent. As mentioned and analyzed above, the region of the cited patent is the interface between the solder platform 17 and the die 16; however, the region of the present invention is within the structure kink 13 rather than the contacting interface, and the micro-deformation labeled 22' is achieved with guidance by the structure kink 13. With this unique structure design, the micro-deformation happening in the present invention **would not** result in the rough contacting interface and damage to the die 16, and definitely can have a better yield over the cited patent.

In view of the above, the cited patent does not teach or suggest the structure kink 13, and cannot make the same technical effects achieved by the present invention, such as avoiding the damage of the die 16 and resulting in the rough interface. Also, the regions of generating the micro-deformations within the present invention and the cited patent are totally different. Thus, the present invention is believed to be patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

* It is believed that no fees are due in connection with this Amendment D other than the three months extension of time fee of \$510.00 which is being paid by check submitted herewith. If, however, the Commissioner determines a fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge said government fees to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lahey, Reg. No. 26,757
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

WEL/lrw

*Enclosure/Attachment

Mail Stop Amendment

Express Mail Label No. EV 695261305 US